

T H E
COMMON SCHOOL JOURNAL
A N D
EDUCATIONAL REFORMER.
NEW SERIES.

WM. B. FOWLE, EDITOR.

VOL. XIV. BOSTON, AUGUST 15, 1852. NO. 16.

THE BOSTON SCHOOLS.

These important schools always interest us, because we were educated in them, and have more than once been concerned in efforts to elevate and improve them. They seem to have periodical convulsions, and owe what little improvement they have experienced, not so much to the school committee or to the teachers, as to accident. In 1790, the first revolution arose from the determination of the citizens to have schools as good as master Bingham's, and the consequence was that girls were admitted to the public schools through the summer; separate schools for the sexes were established; reading schools were provided in connection with the old writing schools (the origin of the double-headed system, which has not yet entirely passed away); and English Grammar and Geography became regular studies. This was certainly a great stride towards perfection.

The schools then had *peace* for about thirty years, when the establishment of the school of Mutual Instruction, of which we accidentally became the teacher, gave rise to another controversy, which resulted in increasing, by at least one-half, the amount of labor done in the schools; in allowing girls to attend school in Winter as well as in Summer; in the introduction of blackboards, map-drawing, &c., and in the establishment of the important fact,

that, on the monitorial plan, one teacher could teach nearly two hundred children of all ages as well, at least, as they are now taught by three or four teachers at twice the expense. This fact, and others like it, have not yet been acted upon, but it can not be long before the good sense of the tax payers of Boston will see that this system is their only resource.

The controversy with Mr. Mann, in 1845-6, was entirely accidental and unexpected on his part. A more rigid supervision was the immediate result, and a careful examination of the schools led to the exposure of defects that astonished the committee as well as the citizens. It is probable that the discipline of the schools was also improved by the shaking they got at that time, but we are assured that corporal punishment is still very much used, and the next convulsion that we shall mention would seem to imply that the removal of many old teachers at that time, and the appointment of new ones, has not materially altered the method of instruction, improved the quality, or increased the amount of it.

The newspapers inform us that a remarkable development of the inefficiency of the schools has just been made in the following accidental manner. Once a year, the better scholars of the grammar schools are transferred to the Classical school, where Greek and Latin only are taught, or to the English High school, where instruction is given in what are called the higher branches of an English education. On examination, the candidates were found to be lamentably deficient in the common branches, and the public eye is turned upon the school committee with the earnest inquiry, "How happens it that, when we pay more per head for every pupil than any other place in the world, the children appear to know less than they do any where else?"

In the Mann controversy the exposure arose from an examination of all the pupils in every school, now it arose from the examination of the select scholars, chiefly such as had received the medals annually given to the best scholars. The Boston Traveller, the champion of the Boston schools, says (Aug. 5), "There *was*, we believe, 112 applicants for admission. The greater proportion (portion) of these boys were medal scholars, those who had won the highest honors in the grammar schools,—and when the test came, only 57 were admitted, and nearly half of the "jewels" of Boston were informed that they were not qualified to commence a course of instruction in the higher branches, until the rudiments were properly acquired. The examination revealed unaccountable ignorance. One boy compared the adjective *bad*,—*bad*, *badder*, *baddest*. [This, certainly, could not be called an *irregular* performance.] Another, when asked what Mason & Dixon's Line was, replied, that it was

a line of Expresses. [If he had said an express line he would not have erred so badly.] One boy answered seven questions correctly out of the forty propounded. One could not find $\frac{1}{4}$ of $\frac{1}{8}$. From one school, 23 boys, comprising nearly all the first class, [in the Boston schools the first class is the highest, and not the lowest, as it ought to be, that new and higher classes may be added if necessary] presented themselves for admission, and only two were sufficiently advanced to be allowed to enter."

Now, we have no doubt that the pupils are quite deficient in practical acquaintance with the elements of even the lowest branches, and yet, we *know* it would be unjust to conclude, from this examination, that the Boston schools are worse than others, or even that all has not been done that the system on which they are conducted can be expected to do. We are told that the trouble did not arise from any unusual vigor in the examination; for the questions asked were less difficult than usual. There could not have been any great difference between the condition of the first classes this year and the last, and it must have been a mere accident that caused the exposure now. It is very certain that the quality of the pupils has changed rapidly of late years, for, although we are not disposed to underrate the mental capabilities of the foreign children which constitute more than one-half of the pupils, still we know that they study under many disadvantages, not the least of which is the ignorance of their parents, and the lack of *home* discipline. It is a fact, also, that many parents wish to have their children enter the High school, when the master thinks they are not qualified, but is unwilling to say so. We know, also, that many a child who knows something in the Grammar school, knows nothing when he appears before the examiners at the High schools. We received the Franklin medal at the Eliot school, and yet when we were asked at the Latin school "what is the perfect participle of the verb to love?" we declared we did not know. Further than this, notwithstanding all the glorification of our Board of Education, and all the efforts of our Normal schools and Teachers' Institutes, we will risk the opinion that the first division of the first class of these very Boston schools, this very year, are equal to the average of the district school *teachers* of New England.

Bad, therefore, as the state of things is, there is nothing new, however alarming it ought to be, in the late exposure, and fortunate will it be, if the accident leads the citizens to take up the subject of their schools, and introduce the reforms that are imperiously demanded. More than twenty years ago, we inquired of one of the teachers of one of our High schools, why pupils so unqualified to enter were admitted, and he candidly replied, "If none but duly qualified pupils were received, the High school

would be closed." The evil now exposed, therefore, has been of long continuance, and will not be removed until the schools of the city are placed in the care of men who understand all their wants, are familiar with all systems, are practical teachers, and can take the lead in introducing the necessary improvements. Not one committee man in ten knows any thing about the schools, not one in a hundred could teach a school half as well as the man he oversees and perhaps censures. The times call for very different men, but who is to select them, and how can they be elected if found?

The papers seem to ascribe the supposed retrogression of the schools to the propensity to introduce the higher branches into the Grammar schools to the neglect of the plainer and more elementary studies. This has no doubt injured the schools, but it is no new evil, for the elements have always been slighted in all the schools of New England. Twenty-five years ago, we dictated a sum in addition to a class of thirty boys, in a Boston Grammar school, most of whom had been through Colburn's Sequel, and not one of them could set down the sum dictated. It must be conceded that, in some respects, especially in reading, the Boston schools have a deservedly good reputation, but it is also true, that they have never been fully entitled to the high reputation they have enjoyed. It has always been a fact that the mass of pupils in the Grammar schools, have never been moved by the system of instruction pursued. The employment of female assistants is an improvement, no doubt, but it has not proved effectual. There is a pride in having large schools, and this evil has increased, we believe, during the past year. We know of no better way to nullify the power of an excellent teacher than to place under him so many, that he can not possibly become intimately acquainted with the wants of each, and impress upon each his own indelible stamp. In a school of 400 to 700 pupils the principal can do little more than attend to the general discipline and arrangement, and the teaching is really done by the young assistants. We believe that *one hundred* is the largest number of pupils that one teacher, however excellent, can teach and govern to advantage, with the usual allowance of assistants; and we should prefer to use our own pupils, rather than any paid assistants, even in this case. If the number be as large as that in the Boston Grammar schools, the mass can not be moved so thoroughly by any process as by that of Mutual Instruction. By this system there is no need of grading schools. Any one who will take the trouble to turn to our essays on this subject, (Vol. XIII, pp. 179, 209, 228,) will see that we there pointed out as a consequence of the grading system, the very defect that has just been exposed. We stated, that, if the older scholars are separated from the younger, in Primary, Inter-

mediate, Grammar and High schools, the moment a child is advanced to a new grade, he drops some of the branches previously studied, if not all of them, and, as he sees nothing of them again in the course, he forgets the elements just in proportion to the assiduity with which he studies the new branches ; whereas, if the lower branches are studied in the same room with the higher, and the older pupils are required to teach, or practice with the younger the elements are not only kept alive but made familiar, and the younger pupils anticipate much by seeing and hearing the older pupils operate. If it be objected, that the older pupils will not have so much time to pursue the higher studies, we say that perfection in the elements is a full off-set for this ; but the fact is as we know by experience, that the time spent in teaching the elements may be viewed in the light of necessary relaxation, and is really time saved. It may be added, that the more thoroughly the pupil is acquainted with the elements, the more rapid and satisfactory will be his progress in the branches, especially if the latter rise out of the former. Take Arithmetic and Mathematics, Geography and History, as illustrations of our remark. We have seen good mathematicians at Teachers' Institutes, who could not add a column of figures correctly, to say nothing of High schools, who knew the leading facts of general history, and could not tell where half the countries were situated.

We are glad to see that the city has established a Normal school of its own, and we earnestly hope that it will make it and keep it a true Normal school, where the art of teaching shall be the first, the second, and the third object of attention. At the risk of being accused of riding our hobby unmercifully, we will add, that if the Grammar and High schools were conducted on the plan of Mutual Instruction, every school would be a Normal school, and all the teaching talent in the community would be developed as it can not be in Normal schools like those of Massachusetts, where there is no chance to put in practice the theories that are taught.

Patience is the sister of Fortitude and the daughter of Resignation. Her bosom friends are Faith and Hope, and her fairest daughter is Peace.

The virtues without charity, are the metals without fire ; they can neither be used apart nor united with good effect.

THE SCHOLAR'S BEVERAGE.

[Written for the Journal.]

MR. EDITOR,—

From a recent number of the *Massachusetts Teacher*, I quote the following somewhat remarkable paragraph. It is found in a speech delivered before the late Teachers' Institute in Boston, by George B. Emerson, of the Board of Education.

"As to diet, do not be afraid of wholesome food of all kinds, in reasonable quantity. Within the same reasonable limits, do not be afraid of tea and coffee, which may, with propriety, be called the Scholar's Beverage.

"Above all, avoid that foolish dream of ignorance, so gross as to see no difference between the Brahmin's constitution, formed by a residence of fifty centuries within or near the tropics, and that of the Saxon, who, ever since we have known him, has been contending with the elements in a cold and severe climate,—I mean, Grahamism."

When I first saw the above, I was inclined to ask, where has Mr. Emerson been for the last quarter of a century,—since the days, I mean, of Coffin, Bell, Condie, Warren, Mussey, and a host of intelligent writers on this subject? He has not been in California, most certainly, for, California is of recent date, and gold, I trust, is not his god.

But, upon the sober second thought, I remembered "The Schoolmaster," written by him some ten or twelve years ago, in which work, in many respects excellent, Mr. E. wrote several pages, with great apparent care, on a subject which he now disposes of in a very few words and a sneer. Is it that he has been making progress towards nature's simplicity,—for, Isaiah Holbrook, the school apparatus man, used to say "it required a good deal of wisdom to say or do a simple thing, whereas a fool might do a complicated one," or has he "advanced backwards," as a neighbor of mine used to say?

I will quote a few passages from the said "Schoolmaster." Mr. Emerson there says, page 294, as follows:—"To no person is an attention to diet more important than to the teacher." And, as if this were not strong enough, he adds, on the same page, "no person needs to be more careful in regard to the quality and nature of his food, than the teacher." The reader will please compare his caution and care of 1842, with his "don't be afraid" of 1852, and make his own inferences.

Again, he says, in 1842, in the "Schoolmaster"—

"The introduction of tea and coffee has justly been considered as one of the great advances in the art of living of modern times, and one cause, among many others, of the increase in the duration of life. They cheer, but do not inebriate, and may be taken moderately, as long as no ill effect is perceived from their use."

Here, it is pretty obvious there has been no advance, either *backwards* or *forwards*, unless, indeed, the title given to these precious drinks, "Scholar's Beverage," is some evidence of a "forward march."

To enable the reader to guess a little on one point, whether Mr. E. is on the good path of progress in dietetics, we will state one fact. "During the seven years ending in 1838, the consumption of coffee in the United States increased 100 per cent., while the population advanced only 33 per cent! Was there a corresponding increase during that period "in the duration of human life?" But, perhaps, Mr. E. will say that effects do not follow their causes so immediately as that would imply. Very well, has there been an increase for the last twenty or thirty years? We have no certain dates on this subject, but, according to Mr. Shattuck, of Boston,—where Mr. Emerson's influence as a teacher is greatest,—the *advance* has been in the other direction.

Mr. E. in 1842, made the following remark (in "the School-master") concerning drinking between meals, which may throw some further light on the subject, he says:—"There are few lessons in regard to diet so important to be inculcated as this, 'Drink not between meals.'" It appears, from his general remarks, that we must drink very little at all, and that only at meals. In other words, we should drink tea and coffee at our meals, and thus exclude from our stomach, the use of cold pure water, which, however, he commends in a general way.

The difficulty is, he is in error throughout, on the subject of drinks. No drinks should be used at meals, whether of one kind or another. If this is not a plain deduction from physiological law, there is none. God has set half-a-dozen fountains in the face to furnish nature's only drink while we are eating. Between our meals, we may and should drink water *in moderation*. Tea and coffee, if taken at all, should be a separate course, entirely. They should never go into the human stomach with food of any kind. But they need not, and should not, be taken at all, except as medicine, Liebig and M. Gasparin to the contrary notwithstanding. The writer knows what he stands upon when he affirms this, and he is ready, were this the place and time, to appeal "to laws and testimony,"—to physiology, pathology and chemistry, and their ablest expounders.

Mr. Emerson's views on diet are nearly as follows:—first, he says some good things,—which have been said by others just as well,—along with which he combines a few things which lie in the line of his education and habits. No man who uses tea and coffee will write against them. There is no reasoning against the stomach and its gastric centre. But he will say, or some of his friends will say for him, “if coffee and tea are hurtful, why have they not hurt Mr. E. already? He has used them a long time, till he is almost an old man, and yet how sleek and healthy he looks?” A man, who was sleeker, and older than he, in years and teaching, said in reply to my assertion that coffee was a slow poison,—“Very slow indeed; for I have used it forty years, and it has not hurt me.” And yet, in one year from that date, he was smitten with paralysis,—smitten, I say, not by God, but by coffee; for by disusing it, at my suggestion, and his son's, he partially recovered from the effects of his paralysis.

The truth is, no one man is able to teach everything; and in meddling with diet Mr. E. has evidently gone quite out of his province. We would not be over gratuitous; but we can assure him that he will do better at home than abroad. The man who is a teacher of teachers should know that whereof he affirms. The writer of this, is not set for the rising and falling of Grahamism, or any other *ism*, and he would not have made these remarks, had he not feared that the position of Mr. Emerson as a teacher, of long standing in high places, and a member of the Board of Education, may lead the inexperienced to think that his advice, in this particular, is sound, and worthy of their regard.

A PHYSICIAN.

INSTRUCTION AND EDUCATION.

In “Trench's Study of Words” just published by Redfield, New York, an attempt is made to show the distinction between the words *Instruction* and *Education*, which many suppose to be synonymous.

“There is indeed no such fruitful source of confusion and mischief as this,—two words are tacitly assumed as equivalent, and therefore exchangeable, and then that which may be assumed, and with truth, of one, is assumed also of the other, of which it is not true. Thus, for instance, it often is with ‘instruction’ and ‘education.’ Can not we ‘instruct’ a child, it is asked, can

not we teach it geography, or arithmetic, or grammar, quite independently of the catechism, or even of the Scriptures? No doubt you may, but can you 'educate' without bringing moral and spiritual forces to bear upon the mind and affections of the child? And you must not be permitted to transfer the admissions which we freely make in regard of 'instruction,' as though they also held good in respect of 'education.' For what is education? Is it a furnishing of a man from without with knowledge and facts and information? or is it a drawing forth from within, and a training of the spirit, of the true humanity which is latent within him? Is the progress of education the filling of the child's mind, as a cistern is filled with waters brought in buckets from some other source, or the opening up of its own fountains? Now, if we give any heed to the word 'education,' and to the voice which speaks in the word, we shall not long be in doubt. Education must 'educere,' being from 'educare' which is but another form of 'educere' and that is 'to draw out' and not 'to put in.' 'To draw out' what is in the child, the immortal spirit which is there, this is the end of education; and so much the word declares. The putting in is indeed most needful; that is, the child must be instructed as well as educated, and the word 'instruction' just means furnishing; but not instructed instead of educated. He must first have powers awakened in him, measures of spiritual value given him; and then he will know how to deal with the facts of this outward world; then, instruction in them, will profit him; but not without the higher training, still less as a substitute for it."

The volume of lectures from which this extract is made is a singular production, and it would be difficult to find one of more pretension and less merit. To say that it is not interesting and even useful, would be to do it injustice, and yet, to say that it is complete or even satisfactory, in any respect, is greatly to overrate it. The lectures may have been fitted for a superficial boarding school of young ladies, but, for a student even of moderate aims, they are as meagre and incomplete as can well be imagined. The greatest defect in the book is the style, of which the extract just given, though selected only for its subject, is about a fair specimen. The punctuation, too, of the whole book, is calculated to obscure the ideas. We do not know how far the author is responsible for this, but he is answerable for the style, and we shall introduce into our *Excerpta Corrigenda* a few sentences from this very extract to show that we are not unreasonably captious. The reader will find, in the extract, proof of the shallowness of the writer, and of a remark we have often made, that students and professors of Greek and Latin are too often indifferent writers of

English. The work, in point of style, is a disgrace to Dr. Trench, "B. D. Vicar of Itchenstoke, Hants, Examining Chaplain of the Lord Bishop of Oxford, and Professor of Divinity, King's College, London," and we caution its readers against any imitation of it.

But the style and language are not the only faults of the extract; it seems to be deficient also in the philosophy of its etymology. It is a great mistake to suppose, as the author seems to do, that the education of a child is only the drawing forth of what is *good*, and of what may be embraced in "the Catechism and the Scriptures," for a child may be educated in error as well as in truth, the evil propensities of his nature may be developed or drawn out to the entire suppression of "the true humanity latent within him," and this the more naturally, if it be true, as the major part of the christian world believe, that the human heart is originally and totally depraved, and, as Solomon says, "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child." It may even be a question whether the Catechism he refers to, and the Scriptures themselves, are not a part of "the knowledge, and facts, and information" which, he says, are furnished from without, by instruction. We suspect that education, in the sense which the author favors, is not, after all, the drawing out of sentiments, as we draw water from a well "in buckets," as the author inelegantly says, but the exercising of the powers and faculties, so that they shall comprehend, and intelligently appropriate the knowledge presented for their consideration. We believe that children have conscience and reverence, just as they have the power of calculation, and they must be educated in the same way; and that teacher, who presents knowledge so that it shall exercise the natural powers of the mind most effectually, will be the most useful and thorough teacher. To use a familiar illustration, we may say, that Colburn's First Lessons and Sequel are calculated to *educate* children, and most of the Arithmetics, that are in use, are only calculated to instruct them, Colburn making the exercise of the intellectual powers essential to every operation, and the others enabling the child to solve the same problems, with little or no exercise of the intellect. [See the next article.]

EXCERPTA CORRIGENDA.

"There is, indeed, no such fruitful source of confusion and mischief as this; — two words are assumed as tacitly equivalent, and, therefore, exchangeable, and then, that which may be assumed, and with truth, of one, is assumed also of the other, of which it is not true."—*Trench's Study of Words*. We should invert the sentences, and express the idea thus, "When two words are assumed

to be equivalent, and therefore exchangeable, and that which may be assumed, with truth, of one, is assumed also of the other, of which it is not true, this is, indeed, a fruitful source of confusion and mischief." *Tacitly* and other words are omitted because they are improper or useless. We have altered the punctuation of the extract, as the reader may see by reference to the preceding article.

"Thus, for instance, it often is with *instruction* and *education*. 'Can not we *instruct* a child,' it is asked, 'can not we teach it Geography, or Arithmetic, or Grammar, quite independently of the catechism, or even of the scriptures.'—*Id.* The reader will please to compare the punctuation, as in the former sentence. The marks of quotation must not be used when a word is not quoted or spoken; but, if it is desirable to distinguish certain words, this may be done by putting them in italics. We should write, "The words *instruction* and *education* furnish an example of this. Can not we *instruct* a child, it is asked, in geography, arithmetic or grammar quite independently of the catechism, &c."

"And you must not be allowed to transfer the admissions, which we freely make in regard of instruction, as though they also held good in respect of education."—*Id.* The word *and* should be omitted, for, it connects words or phrases, and not sentences; and even if it had this power, it would be improperly used here. Pure English writers say, "in regard to," "in respect to."

"For, what is education? Is it a furnishing of a man, from without with knowledge, facts, and information, or is it a drawing forth from within, and a training of the spirit, of the true humanity, which is latent within him?"—*Id.* "For, what is *education*? the furnishing of knowledge, facts, and information from without, or the drawing forth from within; the training of the spirit, of the true humanity, which is latent in man?" The reader will compare the punctuation, as before. There is great obscurity in the whole definition, for it may be asked what is "true humanity?" Does the author mean that this and the "spirit" are the same thing? The language authorizes this inference, and then the question arises, how is the spirit "latent?" It may be unfurnished, inactive, but how latent?

"The putting in is, indeed, most needful, that is, the child must be instructed as well as educated."—*Id.* It is difficult to tell whether the author means to say by "The putting in is *the* most needful," that it is more needful than the drawing out, or whether he only means that it is *very* needful. It is incorrect to say, "the word instruction *just* means furnishing," for, although the author wishes to limit it to this meaning, usage has given it a wider scope, and we fear that all the etymologists in christendom

will never be able to make Englishmen or Americans observe the distinction which originally existed between the two words. But the greatest defect of this sentence is the want of connection between the latter clause, "but not instructed instead of educated," and what precedes it. We can not see any, for, to say the word instruction does not mean "instructed instead of educated," is to utter nonsense.

"He must first have powers awakened in him, * * * and *then* he will know how to deal with facts of this outward world; *then* instruction in these will profit him, but not without the higher training, still less as a substitute for it."—*Id.* By the "higher training" is meant that of *education*, as opposed to *instruction*. The word *then* means when the powers are awakened by education, by the "higher training." The sentence then really is, "Then," that is, *with* the higher training, "instruction in outward knowledge will profit him, but not *without* the higher training, &c." We should omit all after "profit him," and, between *then* and instruction, we should insert the words *and then only*, thus, "Then, and then only, instruction in these will profit him."

A large proportion of the book is composed of similar sentences, and yet were the book on any other subject than language, we should be unwilling to notice it as we do. What we have said has not been said in an unfriendly or captious spirit. We know nothing of the author or publisher, and have no motive but the purest for advising teachers to read the book, but to be on their guard against its serious defects, defects which it professes to remedy! "Ask then words what they mean," says Dr. Trench, "that you may deliver yourselves, that you may help to deliver others from the tyranny of words, and from the strife of word-warriors. Learn to distinguish between them, for the mixture of those things by speech, which by nature are divided, is the mother of all error. What a help, moreover, will it prove to the writing of a good English style, if (instead of) having many words before us, and choosing almost at random (and at hap-hazard) from among them, we at once know which (and which only) we ought (in the case before us) to employ, which will be the exact vesture of our thoughts." Even this eulogy on etymology will not bear examination in point of truth or of style. For, the mixture, that is, the confounding of things by speech is not the mother of ALL error, and the words in parenthesis, and perhaps some others may be omitted without injury to the style or to the sense. We say, therefore, "Physician, heal thyself" before thou canst persuade us that thou hast discovered the key to the correct use of words, to the easy and graceful and idiomatic use of our noble English.

GOD'S MORAL GOVERNMENT OUR MODEL.

MR. EDITOR,—

It seems to be one of your notions, that corporal punishment, or the infliction of bodily pain, ought to be laid aside in our schools, and I agree with you that, much of it, very much of it, may be dispensed with; but there is one consideration which satisfies me, that, were all our teachers what they ought to be, still the necessity for corporal punishment would not be done away. I see, sir, that God, in the government of the world, constantly inflicts pain, and sometimes makes the retribution follow the offence so closely, that we cannot disconnect the idea of sin and suffering. Indeed, I believe that sin is the origin of all pain, and that pain can always be traced to it. If it is not asking too much, I should be glad to hear from you on "The Example of God in the infliction of bodily pain."

Very truly, Yours,

A PASTOR AND TEACHER.

We presume our friend is sincere in his enquiry, and being neither unwilling nor afraid to meet the question he has raised, we shall endeavor, as briefly as possible, to answer it. The field is very wide, and the points of view are so numerous that we can not expect to exhibit them all, or to arrange them in the order of a philosophical essay, we, therefore, write the thoughts as they arise.

We shall not discuss the origin of pain, but we may remark, in passing, that the offences for which children are whipped at School, will hardly come under the head of sins. Whispering and talking, leaving place and idleness, neglected lessons and unpunctuality are the common offences of which the rod takes cognizance; and, even if it were granted that God visits the sins of adults with bodily suffering, it would hardly follow that the slight offences of children should be treated in the same way. The notion that pain proceeds from sin, is an old one, but Christians, we think, are authorized to reject it; for, when the blind man was brought to our Master, and the question directly asked, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind," Jesus at once says, "*Neither.*" We take, therefore, the broad ground, that God does not punish moral offences by physical pain, *in this world*, and, of course, we deny that there is any countenance in his providence, for the infliction of bodily pain for moral offences, in the school or in the family.

We think our view of this important subject is sustained by the Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament, for, Solomon says, "All things come alike to all, there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked;" and David, his father, said, before him, when speaking of the prosperity of the wicked, "There are no bands in their death. They are not in trouble as other men. Their eyes stand out with fatness, and they have more than heart can wish." Both had undoubtedly seen that it was impossible to tell a man's spiritual condition by his outward circumstances. This fact was recognized by Jesus, who warned his disciples not to judge by appearances, and not to imitate their fellow men, but to imitate their Father in heaven, "who maketh his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Nothing can be more indiscriminating than rain and sunshine, and the lesson is so plain that it would seem as if no one could misunderstand it.

But we think the notion, that bodily pain is the punishment of sin or moral offences, is refuted by every thing around us. The blasphemer may offend as long as he has breath, and his tongue will not ache; the oppressor may wring the heart of the widow, or crush the hopes of the dependant, and feel no headache or heartache at their wrongs; the murderer may fear detection, but he will not feel any weakness of muscle or pain of nerve. If it be said the avenger, will pursue him, and he will expiate his crimes on the scaffold, we reply, that he probably will, but this will be man's work and not God's; for it will not do for us to assume that all the punishments inflicted by human governments are approved by God, and that he is responsible for them, for the best of men have been put to death for their fidelity to God and the truth, and the sacrifice of Jesus himself would be deserved punishment.

Our moral nature revolts, furthermore, at the idea of connecting punishment with pain, when we consider that infants suffer much before they are moral agents. It will not do to say they suffer for the sin of Adam or of their ancestors, for no committee would allow a teacher to flog a pupil because his ancestors were not all they should have been. Idiots, too, and maniacs are not moral agents, and yet they suffer pain. Nay, all the lower order of animals suffer pain as much as we do, but it can not be in consequence of moral guilt. Pain has its office, no doubt, but it is not punishment.

If it be said that, although God may not *always* punish moral offences by physical pain, still he sometimes does so, and we are authorized to expect that he will do so in our own or any other case, we reply, that God's laws are not changeable, and his pun-

ishments are certain. Any fickleness, like that supposed, would defeat the end of government, and would very nearly resemble that which we witness in schools, in families, and in communities. God forbid that we should ever be led to think his government resembles that of men. If the punishment of sin were not uniform, it would become uncertain; the divine rule would be considered partial, and, as suffering would overtake the saint as well as the sinner, it would be difficult to distinguish punishment from discipline, and the whole end of punishment would be defeated.

The connection of sin and punishment, of moral offences and bodily pain, if it could be demonstrated to exist in this world, would we think prove too much, much more than our friend and correspondent would desire; for, if it be true that the actions of men are judged and even punished in this world, the doctrine of a future judgment, and future rewards and punishments for the deeds done in the body, would certainly lose its chief support, that which arises from the triumphs of vice and the sufferings of virtue, and the unequal distribution of what men call good and evil in the world.

What then is the true theory which our correspondent has mistaken? If physical pain is not a consequence of the infraction of moral laws, of what is it the consequence? Let us ascertain by an example. It is a law of God that men shall be temperate. This is the moral law. It is also a law of God that excess shall produce disease. This is the physical law. The man who scorns the moral law will suffer no inconvenience, but as soon as he breaks the physical law, he must pay the penalty. All bodily pain, therefore, arises from the infraction of physical laws, and the sinner may lie, cheat, steal, swear, dishonor his parents, worship false gods, and break every command of the decalogue, without needing a physician or feeling any bodily inconvenience.

We have thus endeavored, as briefly as we could, to answer the inquiry of our correspondent. We hope that, whether pastor or teacher, or both, as he professes to be, he will abandon, totally and immadiately, the old notion that fear of the rod rather than the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom. Let him cultivate his own mind and heart, and never conclude that a child or a sinner is incorrigible because HE can not convince him, or deserving of punishment because HE has lost his patience. Let him become a teetotal abstinent from corporal punishment, as I trust he is from intoxicating drinks. Let him give up the old practice of requiring an eye for an eye; let him determine, as Jesus commands him, to "resist not evil," and as Paul advises, to "Be not overcome of evil but overcome evil with good." If he thinks the rod is good, and overcoming a disobedient temper by inflicting bodily

pain is overcoming evil with good, let him mistrust his logic, and be assured that his suffering pupil will never believe it. Let him remember the advice of Paul to young Timothy, which is a model address to young teachers, "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all; apt to teach; patient; in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves." Let him recollect that true "Charity suffereth long and is kind," and, when his heart faints, and he is inclined to ask how much longer he must bear and forbear, let him remember that "Charity NEVER faileth."

THE LAW IN REGARD TO PERIODICALS.


Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary, are considered as continuing. If the paper continues to be sent, one of two things is certain,—either the notice has not reached the Publisher, or the subscriber owes some arrearages, and by law is responsible for all papers sent, until the whole arrearage is paid. It is very common for subscribers erroneously to suppose they have given notice to the Publisher, because they have spoken to the Postmaster, or refused to take the paper out of the office. Because a subscription is payable *in advance*, he who pays for one year has no right to expect that the paper will not be sent a second year, because he does not send his dollar. We do our duty, whether he does his or not.


NOTICE.

We have an entire set of the Journal, bound, in 13 vols.; price, \$16. We have no single numbers of the first ten volumes, and few numbers of any subsequent volume.—Price of single numbers, 5 cts. Our translation of Dr. Wallis's English Grammar, the first and best ever published, (more than 200 years ago,) will be sent by mail, free of postage, for 25 cts.

THE PUBLISHER'S NOTICE.

HENRY W. QUIN is our Advertising Agent for New York City. Agents to obtain Subscribers will be allowed a liberal commission.

 All Advertisements, Communications for the Journal, Exchanges, and Books to be reviewed, must be sent to the Editor, "Wm. B. Fowle, West Newton, Mass."

 Published semi-monthly, at \$1.00 a year, in advance, by MORRIS COTTON, No. 3 Cornhill, Boston, to whom all remittances of money should be made, free of expense.

STACY & RICHARDSON, Printers, 11 Milk Street, Boston.